

THE

# Phrenological Review

---

VOL. I.

JULY, 1905.

No. 2.

---

## THE SEAT OF THE INTELLECT: PHRENOLOGY CORROBORATED BY MODERN MEDICAL SCIENCE.

BY C. W. WITHINSHAW, L.R.C.P., L.R.C.S. (EDIN).

From the time of the founder of Phrenology, Gall, his followers have maintained that the seat of those centres or organs of the brain, whose function is the manifestation of the intellectual faculties, is the anterior portion of the frontal lobe of the brain, or, according to modern topographical anatomy, the prefrontal region of the brain. It is necessary for me to try to define what is meant by this prefrontal region of the brain, for, although anatomists and physiologists frequently use the term prefrontal, I have not met with its definition. I define the prefrontal region of the brain as the portion of the frontal lobe in front of a vertical line passing through the point of division of the fissure of Sylvius on the external surface of the hemisphere. On the skull it corresponds roughly to the frontal bone, but it does not extend so far backwards as the upper part of this bone does, the posterior boundary being a vertical line drawn upwards from the anterior inferior-angle of the parietal bone. On the head the prefrontal region corresponds, usually, to the forehead; or, to be more precise, to the frontal area anterior to a vertical line passing through a point midway between the ear and the outer margin of the orbit.

Understanding what we mean, anatomically, by the prefrontal region of the brain, let us inquire what is known of its physiology or function. To do this properly, I think we must make a passing reference to the history of the physiology

of the entire brain. Descartes said that the seat of the soul was the pineal gland, that minute body which is deeply placed near the centre of the brain. Sœmmering said that the only medium possible for the combining of all those sensations and impressions necessary for the manifestations of the soul must be a fluid one, therefore the seat of the soul is the fluid in the ventricles of the brain. Others, very eminent in their day, in their fanciful speculations as to the seat of the mind, located it in various other parts of the body, till it eventually became the general opinion that the entire brain was the organ for the manifestations of the mind, and that in each and all of its operations the brain acted as a whole.

Then there appeared on the scene a master-mind, a genius—the illustrious and immortal Gall. But, in paying a tribute to the memory of our worthy founder, let us not be unmindful of the noble part taken in the development of phrenology by that giant in philosophy and intellect, Spurzheim—lest we forget that he was the first to make phrenology a practical science, applicable to the estimation of the affections, talents and moral qualities of man ; in other words, to the delineation of human character. After years of patient toil and penetrating research, not only in the human field of inquiry, but covering the whole domain of the animal kingdom, Dr. Gall propounded the doctrine that in the exercise of its functions the brain does not act as a whole, but that each distinct function is performed by a distinct portion of the brain, and that therefore the brain may be considered an aggregation of organs, each having a special function. He relied chiefly on observing the differences in the form and make-up of the brains of animals, and noted their relationship to the propensities, instincts and intelligence of those animals ; and, above all, observed in man the connection between the proportionate development of his brain, as indicated by the form and dimensions of his cranium, and the manifestations of the various faculties of his mind.



And what functions did Gall assign to this prefrontal region of the brain? As you are well aware, he located in this area of the brain the organs of the intellectual faculties. But, before proceeding further in our investigation of the functions of the prefrontal region of the brain, let us stop to inquire whether Gall's methods were sound. Was he correct in supposing that the proportionate development of the brain can be estimated by the form and dimensions of the cranium? Do anatomists admit this—that is, anatomists who have not allowed their judgment to be warped by phrenological notions? Well, one authority is as good as a hundred, and ours shall be no less than the late professor of anatomy of the University of Cambridge—Sir George Murray Humphry. On this point he says, in his monumental work, “The Human Skeleton” :—“The skull is moulded upon the brain and grows in accordance with it. It is subservient to the brain, and there can be no question that the size and general shape of the brain can be estimated with tolerable accuracy by the size and general shape of the skull ; and, further, that we may form a pretty correct notion of the relative proportions of the cerebral lobes by observing the proportions of the corresponding parts of the skull.” Surely that is a very striking testimony in favour of the phrenological method of research—studying the proportionate development of the brain by the shape and dimensions of the skull. But I fancy some of the more critical of you will be thinking, “Yes, that's all very good, but you said the *late* professor of anatomy in the University of Cambridge. Can't you refer us to a living anatomist of eminence for an opinion on this most important point?” Yes, I think I can, and he shall be none other than the present occupant of the chair of anatomy in that orthodox University, Professor Macalister. In reference to the relationship between skull and brain, his words are these :—“Brain-shape determines skull-shape, and is the mould on which the skull is developed.”

Now, knowing that we have firm grounds for our belief in the shape of the skull being a safe guide to the estimation of

the development of the brain, is there any condition that phrenologists, without being experts in anatomy or physiology (even the man in the street), can observe, with a view to ascertaining the truth of our doctrine that the prefrontal region of the brain is concerned in intellectual manifestations? Yes, surely we have it in that remarkable phenomenon, the idiot's skull; for, although idiocy in general is due to disease of the brain, and may occur in a subject having a brain-size even above the normal, yet there is a type of brain that is so deficient in this prefrontal region as to always indicate an idiotic condition of mind, the corresponding want in the skull being marked by a low and contracted forehead. This variety of skull belongs to the class of idiots called microcephalic, *i.e.*, small-headed. And on examining the microcephalic skull we find that, though the cranium is small and contracted in all its dimensions, it is most markedly so in the fore-part, the frontal bone being low, narrow and receding. This coincides with the mental defects of the idiot; for, although the feelings and propensities may be strong, in intellect idiots remain children all their lives; and, with respect to the intellect, the reflective part is much more defective than the perceptive, for the idiot does not reason at all.

How exactly this confirms the phrenological view as to the functions of the prefrontal region of the brain, the forehead, especially the upper part, being strikingly deficient, and the intellect, especially the reflective kind, being deplorably feeble!

Now, let us pass on to enquire whether the investigations of brain-specialists of more recent times confirm the discoveries of Gall a century ago as to the functions of this region of the brain. The first, in our time, to make any discovery in the localization of function in the brain was a physician of Paris, named Broca, who, in 1861, after investigating cases of brain-disease, following the fatal cases to the post-mortem room, showed that the function of producing spoken language is intimately associated with the integrity of the posterior part of the inferior frontal convolution of the left hemisphere of

the brain. Surely this was only a confirmation of Gall's localization of "verbal memory and spoken language," not only in the same convolution (inferior frontal), but also in the same portion (posterior) of this convolution.

But the active mind of some of my critics will suggest, "Yes, that's very good up to a certain point ; but what about that *left* hemisphere of the brain, whereas Gall made no such distinction?" On such an intricate point as this I will not presume to pass judgment, but will give you the opinion of one of the most eminent living authorities on nervous affections, Sir William Gowers. These are his very words on this point : "The left hemisphere has by no means a monopoly of speech function. The right hemisphere contains structures of similar position and similar connections. These structures can supplement those in the left hemisphere. Loss of speech due to permanent destruction of the speech region in the left hemisphere has been recovered from ; and that this recovery was due to the supplemental action of the corresponding region of the right hemisphere is proved by the fact that in some of these cases speech has been again lost when a fresh lesion has occurred in this part of the right hemisphere." What clear, convincing testimony to the phrenological localization of the faculty of speech in both hemispheres!

Following the same lines (clinical) as Broca, but independently, one of the greatest nerve specialists in this country, Hughlings Jackson, from a study of cases of partial epilepsy affecting only certain groups of muscles, and following lesion of certain circumscribed areas of the brain in man, also came to the conclusion, in 1868, that particular areas of the brain have distinct functions.

The laboratory experts come in the last of all in the determination of the localization of function in the brain, being about three-quarters of a century later than Gall, and also years after the physicians Broca and Hughlings Jackson.

Two German observers, Fritsch and Hitzig, in 1870, first published their experiments on the dog's brain, which clearly showed that the cortex of the brain could be electrically

excited, and that the result, as manifested by muscular movement in different parts, varied according to the special motor areas of the brain stimulated. These experiments were verified and amplified by those of Ferrier in 1873 upon the brain of the dog, monkey, and many other animals, and his results have been confirmed by many other observers. The results of stimulating the prefrontal region of the brain are practically *nil*, and so it has been termed by these men one of the "latent" or "silent" areas of the cortex.

Let us see what the result was when they destroyed this portion of the brain. I will give you the result in Dr. Ferrier's own words: "Destruction of the frontal lobes in monkeys causes the aspect of uninterest and stupidity, the absence of that active curiosity which is naturally manifested by monkeys, and the mental degradation which seems to depend on the loss of the faculty of attention and all it implies in the sphere of intellectual operations." I think you will endorse my opinion that this result strongly substantiates the phrenological dictum that the prefrontal region of the brain is the seat of those centres or organs which manifest intellectual power. But as a final confirmation of our doctrines, let us examine the effects of experiments on the living human brain. I hope I have not seriously shocked you by referring to experiments on the human brain, for, although undoubtedly such experiments are constantly being performed, who is the experimentalist? Not man, but disease. Let us see what happens to the individual in whom disease or injury attacks this region of the brain. Its direct effect is shown by a lack of intelligence and a marked deficiency of intellectual power; while, as an indirect result, the passions are apt to run riot, through the withdrawal of the inhibitory or checking power of this region of the brain, and the religious faculties are prone to go to extremes through being deprived of the light and guidance of intelligence and reason.

Therefore, whether we test the phrenology of this prefrontal region of the brain by the light of experimental investigation or by the ravages of disease, the result is the

same, entirely corroborative. But, as a final proof, let us pass from the general to the particular, from the abstract to the concrete, and examine, with the eye and brain of a phrenologist, a case of tumour affecting this region of the brain in man, and see whether it lends support to the phrenological doctrine that this brain area is not only intellectual in function, but that it is subdivided into special centres or organs.

The case I have to present to you was recently reported in the *Lancet*, and is that of a man who was afflicted with a tumour located in the prefrontal region of the left hemisphere of his brain. The tumour consisted of a firm nodular mass, rather like a tomato in shape. It measured two inches long, by one-and-a-half inches broad, and one-and-a-quarter in thickness. The situation of the tumour was behind the frontal pole, immediately beneath the grey layer. Therefore, as it grew, it would press the cortical covering of the brain in this region against the firm skull, squeeze out the blood, and so annihilate the function of the centres in this area. The phrenological centres involved in this case were Causality (as the central one), with Comparison on its inner side and Wit on its outer, and below Eventuality, Locality and Time. Now let us review the history of the case, and see whether there were any symptoms indicating an impairment of the functions of the organs. In doing so I shall, as far as practical with making it brief, use the words of the medical men who reported the case.

The man was forty-seven years of age, and had enjoyed good health previous to the present illness, which began by his suffering from pain in the left frontal region, where it subsequently remained localised. He continued at his work for four months, when he became depressed, refused to leave his bed, and would not speak to his wife. His memory became affected, so that he would forget in a few minutes what he had been saying. He became emotional, and would begin to weep at the sight of his friends—as his wife expressed it, “he became kind o’ soft.” (What interesting evidence of the



inhibitory action of the intellect over the emotions!) It was also a source of annoyance to his friends that he seemed to lose all sense of decency and shame. (Surely a point in favour of the refining influence of the intellect over the propensities.) At times he appeared not to be aware where he was, and when in his own house he would say to his wife, "Let us get away from here." During the night, especially, he seemed to lose his bearings, and did not know where he was. (What about our organ of Locality?)

All of the patient's symptoms gradually got worse, and so he was sent to Leith Hospital. While there he developed some very interesting symptoms. His responses to questions were correctly expressed, but he could not sustain his attention for any length of time. As regards the affection of his memory, it appeared to be not so much a blotting out of his past impressions as a want of power of associating memories, of comparing and contrasting them. Lack of judgment, therefore, was a marked feature of his mental condition. There was no aphasia. He could name objects at sight quite well. He had no difficulty in recalling words or names, but he answered questions in such a way as to indicate that he took no interest in what he was saying. When asked his name he gave it all right, but when asked his age, he said "Sixteen." He was then asked if he was a hundred, and he answered, "Yes, more than a hundred." When asked where he lived, he gave the name of a street he lived in a few years previously. On being asked if he lived in S—— Street (where he really did live), he said, "Yes." When asked, "Where are you living now?" he said "Here."

Shortly after this the patient became so dangerously ill with symptoms of stupor, difficulty in swallowing, and embarrassed breathing, that the only chance of saving his life was by operation. This was performed in the Leith Hospital, by Dr. Miles, the surgeon. He trephined the skull in the region of the left frontal eminence, and the tumour was removed without any hæmorrhage. The day following the operation the patient was so far recovered as to know he



was in hospital, recognise his wife, and answer questions. Six days after operation, he remembered events that had happened some time after his admission to hospital, but not those immediately preceding. He did not remember coming to hospital. He was able to be up in less than a month after the operation, and had continued well up to the time the case was reported.

I think you will agree with me that the physician and surgeon into whose hands the patient was so fortunate to fall deserve the highest praise for bringing so serious a case to such a triumphant issue. And I also consider we ought to feel grateful to those gentlemen for so fully reporting the mental symptoms of a case which affords such strong corroborative evidence of the truth of the phrenological teaching as to the functions of this region of the brain.

In conclusion, I think our survey of the physiology and pathology of this prefrontal region of the brain enables us to assert :—

1. That Gall was the first to discover that the prefrontal area of the brain is the seat of the organs of the intellectual faculties.
2. That the investigations of experimentalists of more recent times tend to confirm Gall's localization.
3. That the effects of injury or disease of this region of the brain corroborate the phrenological doctrine that this area is not only the seat of the intellect, but that it is composed of a number of organs or centres, each having a special function.

---

## EDITORIAL NOTES AND REVIEWS.

---

### OUR FIRST NUMBER.

---

We have to thank several correspondents for their expression of appreciation of the first number of *The Phrenological Review*. We have also to acknowledge several

critical communications from members who are unanimous on one point, namely, that the Review should not be conducted on "medical" lines only, since there are other applications of phrenology besides that to the science of medicine. We are fully aware of this, but in a first number, which, by-the-bye, we had to prepare within forty-eight hours, we thought it advisable to state the present position of our science and to describe the treatment it is receiving from recognised learned authorities. Moreover, we are of opinion that new facts, whether they be "medical," or belong to other branches of science, should find a place in our journal, since many of our members *lecture* on the subject and require to be up-to-date. It is for their benefit that we publish them.

It was originally arranged that Dr. Withinshaw's interesting article, though it is also medical, shall be published in this number, and that other experts, viewing phrenology from other points of view, shall contribute to succeeding issues. All shall be heard in time. The small size of the Review prevents us from publishing more than one article in any single number; and we regret, that on account of the long interval of publication, we cannot do justice to the more prominent exponents of our doctrine more quickly. The reader has it in his own power to remedy this by subscribing more liberally to the "Journal Fund."

---

## DR. ALBERT WILSON ON PHRENOLOGY.

---

Dr. Albert Wilson, a medical gentleman who recently achieved some notoriety through a paper he read on "Multiple Personality" to the Psychical Research Society, gave a lecture on "The Brain in relation to Phrenology" to the Leyton Phrenological Society on April 14th, being invited by Mr. James Webb, the successful founder and organiser of that institution. Mr. E. R. Alexander, E.C.C., presided. The lecture excited a great deal of controversy in the Leyton press, and we have to compliment Mr. Webb for

the able defence of the subject, the discussion of which is still proceeding. Here are some interesting extracts from the lecture:—

1. "I once fancied myself a clever phrenologist, and studied it with sincerity. I also studied faces, and I flatter myself there are few people who can read or discover character better than myself."

2. "I was amazed on receiving a bust from Mr. Webb to see how many faculties there are with their locations on the skull. The organ of philoprogenitiveness is over a thick bony mass. There is no brain underneath it, but a huge system of veins or blood-sinuses. The eyebrows, moreover, which are mapped out on the phrenological bust as the organs of size, weight, colour, figures, lie on air spaces, and no part of the brain beyond bears any relationship to the mental faculties."\*

3. "Some of what the phrenologists term 'the faculties of the mind' are buried inside the folds of the brain surface; therefore no impartial mind can understand how the phrenologist can gauge their capacity or even their existence from outside the skull."†

4. "Many unbiassed scientists have finally mapped out the brain surface, and not one of your faculties has been discovered. Destructiveness lies over the taste centre."‡

5. "Amativeness is placed in the cerebellum, over the

---

\* Notice that Dr. Wilson, who "once fancied himself a clever phrenologist," is unaware that Gall's localisations were made in the brain and not on the skull. Dr. Wilson criticised the book on "The Mental Functions of the Brain," yet from this extract it is evident that he never looked even at the illustrations.

† This objection is a hackneyed one and arises from the same neglect of Gall's works, wherein it will be found that the inside convolutions have the same functions as the centre ones on the surface, identical with the modern localisation of motor centres.

‡ We question that the scientists were "unbiassed," and the reason why they failed to discover *mental* centres is simply that the electrification of anæsthetised animals will never reveal their thoughts and feelings, but can have only physical effects. Dr. Wilson's localisation of destructiveness over the taste centre shows his complete ignorance of the subject, and is a disgrace for any critic.

centre, which is a complex steering gear. This is all rubbish. The cerebellum has no more relation to that type of instinct than the big toe."||

6. "The brain floats inside the skull."§

7. "Volume and intelligence may or may not go hand in hand. The brain of a navvy or a dock labourer in most cases will weigh more than that of a bishop, a judge, or a scientist. In the average man or woman there is comparatively little difference between the brain of the intellectual man and the uneducated. This reduces us to a very hopeless position if we are to rely on size and contour."\*

8. "The real truth is that we know very little about this intricate subject, and I appeal to your common sense and your higher moral ideation to answer me, how can you know more of these matters than we who are experts? My object in coming to-night is to lay the truth before you, so that none can say they have not heard it. As honest men you must bury your old phrenology. You may amuse yourselves with it

||Dr Wilson not only demonstrates his ignorance of phrenology, but also his want of knowledge of medical research, for he never read of Risien Russell's researches, not to speak of Professor Nothnagel and others, that disease of the cerebellar hemispheres does not affect locomotion until it involves the centre part, the vermiform process. He is ignorant of the physiological experiments and the number of clinical cases which corroborate our theory.

§This statement shows ignorance of anatomy. Here is Sir Frederick Treves' opinion:—"It is commonly stated that the brain may be considered to be suspended in fluid, but this is a very erroneous view, for the brain is in a serous cavity, in which normally little or no fluid exists. The amount of fluid in the subdural space is only enough to prevent friction during the movements of the brain. The fluid which is in the subarachnoid space over the convexity of the brain is insignificant."

\* This "expert" phrenologist has not learned that we do not take the size of the *entire* brain as a measure of *intellect*, but only the size of the frontal lobes. Hence we are not surprised that he cannot see any difference between the brain of an "intellectual" man and the "uneducated," who, by-the-bye, may have natural gifts far superior to the educated man. That the brain of a navvy weighs more than that of a bishop is one of those loose statements for which Dr. Wilson could give no authority. All the brain weights recorded in anthropological literature show the opposite.

as a species of quackery. Opinions must be thrown to the winds, and let each one of us not forget the wholesome lines :  
' Fools rush in where angels fear to tread.' \*\*

---

## REPORT OF MEETINGS.

---

### SOCIAL MEETING AND PRESIDENT'S ADDRESS.

---

The April meeting was of a social character, songs and recitations being interwoven with the more serious Phrenological items.

Mr. J. Millott Severn delivered his presidential address. In thanking the members for the honour conferred upon him, he said he desired to be of service to the Society and hoped all would co-operate with him during his term of office. His address consisted of a review of the history of mental science, from the days of ancient Greece, to the present time. Both the old metaphysicians and the new psychologists had failed to give a satisfactory explanation of the workings of the mind. The doctrine of Gall as to localisation of mental function, which had been systematised and to a certain extent perfected by his scientific followers, supplied the deficiency. The present position and future prospects of Phrenology were dealt with in an optimistic spirit.

Mr. George Hart-Cox spoke on "Some limitations of Phrenology." Phrenology, he said, was by no means perfect ; it had limitations. There was plenty of room for further investigation, discovery and development. The mental functions of probably one-fourth of the area of convoluted

---

\* The above are the only statements with which we are in hearty agreement. The lecturer's confession of "the real truth" that those who take his view "know very little about this intricate subject," we cannot find fault with, and since his facts have been proved to be mere opinions without foundation, he does well to remember that "Fools rush in where angels fear to tread." But when he says he laid the "truth" before us, we are sorry, for the credit of medical science, that he ever spoke. Critics who want to prove phrenology to be "quackery," really should set a better example than Dr. Wilson has done.

grey matter had yet to be discovered. As illustrating the practical use of Phrenology, even with all its limitations, he related the case of an errand boy, he once met, whom he recommended to study science, because he saw by the formation of his head that the lad would excel. The young man called on him recently and informed him that he had taken his advice and "Attended evening classes at the Battersea Polytechnic, got on well, passed with honours, won some scholarships, and was recommended to a post as analytical chemist in a large manufacturing concern. I thought I would like to come and thank you, before going away to take up the duties of the new appointment."

Dr. Bernard Hollander read a paper contrasting the "Two views of Phrenology," the opponents' view and ours.

A pleasant feature of the evening was the presentation of a beautiful clock in black marble to Dr. C. W. Withinshaw, in a fitting speech by Mr. James Webb, on behalf of the Council and some friends. The inscription on the clock was as follows :—

PRESENTED TO DR. C. W. WITHINSHAW,  
L.R.C.P., L.R.C.S., L.M.EDIN., F.B.P.S.

FROM HIS COLLEAGUES

on the

EXECUTIVE OF THE BRITISH PHRENOLOGICAL SOCIETY INCORPORATED.

63, *Chancery Lane, W.C.*,

As a token of their high esteem and appreciation of his courageous advocacy and untiring devotion in the cause of Phrenology during the three years 1902, 1903, and 1904, in which he held the position of President of the Society.

Dr. Withinshaw, in acknowledging the compliment, expressed his happy surprise at receiving such a presentation, for which he thanked the donors in hearty terms.

---

## THE TWENTY CHIEF DOCTRINES OF PHRENOLOGY.

---

At the May Meeting of the Society Mr. James Webb gave a lecture entitled "The Twenty Chief Doctrines of Phrenology," which briefly stated, he described as follows :—The brain is

the organ of the mind. The mind is endowed with faculties, any of which may be active or passive during the exercise of other faculties, or may singly preserve or lose their normal state of activity. Mental faculties are innate; they manifest themselves through brain-organs or "centres." The brain is an aggregation or congeries of organs. The power of manifesting any faculty bears a relation to the condition of its centre or organ. Other conditions being equal, as health, temperament, etc., size is a measure of power. When the development of the brain is imperfect, the mental functions are correspondingly imperfect. Insanity is a disordered condition of the mind resulting from an unhealthy condition of the brain, or of an inharmonious development of the brain-organs. Idiocy is the result of deficiency or of disorder of the brain-substance, which may be limited to one or more regions. The skull and brain are con crescent; their growth is reciprocal and complementary. Temperament affects mental activity. The faculties vary in power and activity according to their cultivation and use. The organs of the intellect are located in the frontal lobes; those serving the moral sentiments in the coronal regions, and those of the affections in the occiput and cerebellum. The temporal region is the seat of the self-preservative organs. There are 37 well established centres devoted to mental operations. The exterior of the skull affords indications of the position and development of the cerebral organs and of the cerebellum. A phrenologist is able to form an estimate of the characteristics and talents of a person in proportion to his own mental capacity, his experience, and education.

### **MEMORY.**

At the June Meeting Mr. William Cox read a paper on "Memory."

Memory, the author of the paper said, was generally understood to be the ability to recall anything that had already found a place in the mind. There were some curious phenomena connected with memory. For example, how



easy some people found it to memorise things which others had great difficulty in remembering. This affinity of certain minds for special lines of knowledge had been noticed by John Locke; but he did not tell us why some instinctively choose and retain one kind of knowledge in preference to another. It was left to phrenology to give an adequate explanation of this. And it was to be found in the distinctive teaching as to the relation which exists between size of a definite part of the brain and the power of a particular faculty of the mind. The mass of evidence of this character that had been collected by observers formed one of the bulwarks of phrenology. Unlike other systems of psychology, the science of phrenology did not warrant us in saying that there was a faculty of the mind called memory. It taught that the elementary faculties of the mind—a list of which and their primitive powers could be seen in any good work on the subject—are each concerned with their own work, and that the power to receive, retain, and to reproduce impressions was a property inherent in them each and all, each after its kind. Then again, by means of association-fibres connecting part with part of the grey matter in the cortex of the brain, co-operative action amongst the organs was established, in addition to the individual responsibility of each organ. The bearing of this upon the subject of memory was most interesting, as it explained the association of ideas. One organ in exercise stirred into activity others, and in this way impressions became manifold; the power to retain them was compound, and the ability to recall them was thereby made stronger than would be the case if memory were a simple faculty.

Miss E. Higgs followed Mr. William Cox at the June Meeting with a paper entitled: Phrenology as a Science, Art, and Philosophy.



## THE JOURNAL FUND.

---

Mr. Edgar Gardner, the Hon. Treasurer of the Journal Fund, on behalf of the Society, has much pleasure in acknowledging the following further donations, in addition to the sums already announced in our last number:—

						£	s.	d.
Thomas G. Carson, Esq.	...	...	...	...	...	1	0	0
Jas. B. Eland, Esq.	...	...	...	...	...	0	10	6
J. H. Campbell, Esq.	...	...	...	...	...	0	10	0
J. E. Flegg, Esq.	...	...	...	...	...	0	5	0
E. J. Poulton, Esq.	...	...	...	...	...	0	5	0
						<hr/>		
						£2	10	6
						<hr/>		

Members receive a copy of the Review free of charge, but it is to be hoped that many of them will become subscribers of extra copies, which they can send to friends interested in the subject; to opponents, whom they wish to enlighten as to the scientific basis of phrenology; and some good may be done by sending a copy to the local public library. Members can thus propagate the truth of our doctrine for the insignificant yearly subscription of one shilling, a sum which everyone should be able to spare.

Remittances and orders for *The Phrenological Review* should be sent to the Hon. Treasurer of the Journal Fund, Edgar Gardner, Esq., 78, Edith Grove, Fulham Road, London, S.W.

Communications referring to the literary contents of *The Phrenological Review* should be addressed to the Editor, Dr. BERNARD HOLLANDER, 62, Queen Anne Street, Cavendish Square, London, W.

# British Phrenological Society (Incorporated),

63, CHANCERY LANE, LONDON, W.C.

---

## THE OBJECT OF THE SOCIETY

is the investigation and promulgation of Phrenology, and the study of such kindred subjects as the Physiology of the Brain, Craniology, Anthropology, Psychology, and Educational Science.

**PRACTICAL AND SCIENTIFIC MEETINGS ARE HELD IN ADDITION  
TO THE MONTHLY LECTURES**

**MEMBERS HAVE THE USE OF A COMPREHENSIVE LIBRARY.**

---

**Annual Subscription : Ten Shillings.**

---

The next Meeting will take place on

TUESDAY, OCTOBER 10th, 1905.

Lecture by J. B. ELAND, Esq., on "CONSTRUCTIVENESS."

**F. R. WARREN, Hon. Secretary.**

# What is Phrenology ?

Phrenology is a system of physiological psychology, localising the various primary mental powers in definite regions of the brain, and is based on experimental, clinical and pathological evidence, besides that of practical observation.

Thus the intellectual and moral powers, the highest attributes of man, are located in the frontal lobes—*i.e.*, that part of the brain, the size of which distinguishes man from animals ; and the remaining lobes contain the centres for those fundamental feelings and emotions which form the character of the individual.

The size of the entire brain, therefore, is an indication of mental power, but whether that power is intellectual or lies in strength of feeling depends on the region which is most highly developed.

The size and shape of the brain can be estimated by the size and shape of the skull, a truth demonstrated repeatedly by the leading anatomists of the day.

Its ready method of diagnosing individual capacities and character renders Phrenology, not only the most practical system of psychology, but also an invaluable aid to the successful education of the young, to the treatment of crime, and the proper understanding of insanity.

B. H.

# THE PHRENOLOGICAL REVIEW,

*The Journal of the Incorporated British Phrenological Society.*

---

To E. GARDNER, Esq.,

78, EDITH GROVE, FULHAM ROAD, LONDON, S.W.

*Dear Sir,*

*I herewith enclose P.O. for \_\_\_\_\_, being my Subscription for*

*\_\_\_\_\_ copies per annum, from this date.*

*\_\_\_\_\_ extra copies of \_\_\_\_\_ number.*

*Yours faithfully,*

*Name* \_\_\_\_\_

*Address* \_\_\_\_\_

*Date* \_\_\_\_\_

**Annual Subscription** per copy for four quarterly issues, **ONE SHILLING.**

Reduction on quantities over one dozen copies, and to the Trade.